

Remarks:

Claims 1-15 remain for consideration in this application.

The claims have been rejected on the basis of Woods Pat. No. 6,443,985. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The '985 patent is in relevant part equivalent to previously cited and overcome Pat. No. 6,217,612. Turning to the present claims, the last paragraph of claim 1 recites that the positioning member comprises a main body including anterior and posterior segments, with the optic connected to the positioning member in a location central to the anterior and posterior segments.

The '985 patent does not disclose or suggest this arrangement. For example, as seen in Fig. 2 of the reference, the optic 30 is coupled to a posterior-extending positioning member, and is not centrally located relative to anterior and posterior segments of a positioning member. Therefore, the claims clearly and structurally distinguish all of the teachings of the '985 patent.

Applicants and their attorneys would like to thank the Examiner for his time and courtesies during the recent personal interview in connection with this case. At that interview, the foregoing claimed structural differences were pointed out to the Examiner, and it was agreed that the claims did patentably distinguish the art. Therefore, allowance of this application when next reached for consideration is appropriate and is respectfully solicited.

Any additional fee which is due in connection with this Response should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 19-0522.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Tracy Bornman, Reg. No. 42,347

HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP

2405 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400

Kansas City, Missouri 64108

816/474-9050

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS